DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 253 578 TM 850 124

AUTHOR	Guzzetti, Barbara J.
TITLE	Report on Instruments for Measuring School Effectiveness.
INSTITUTION	Mid-Continent Regional Educational Lab., Aurora, CO.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	84p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, 2600 S. Parker Rd., Building 5, Suite 353, Aurora, CO 80014.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Evaluation; Measurement Techniques; *Questionnaires; *School Effectiveness; Test Reliability; Test Validity

ABSTRACT

An extensive search of the literature and existing programs was undertaken to identify instruments that were being used to measure school effectiveness. Twenty-four instruments are currently available and are critiqued in this publication. Each critique reports the format and components of the instrument, its intended purpose and uses, reliability and validity information, distribution information, the supplemental materials available, and a description of its content. Four additional instruments in preparation are listed. This report also lists the districts using each instrument, and related instruments. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED253578

REPORT ON INSTRUMENTS FOR MEASURING SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

Barbara J. Guzzetti, Ph.D.

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

2600 S. Parker Road, Building 5, Suite 353

Aurora, Colorado 80014

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Riley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CS 008 124

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory ©1983

ABSTRACT

This review used two questions: "What is an effective school?" and "How is an effective school measured?" These questions led us to three types of literature. The first type was the "How to" literature--the numerous articles and reports on how to identify an effective school. That literature addressed issues and criticisms involved in defining an effective school - for example, the limitations of using achievement test scores as sole criteria for labeling one school effective and another ineffective. That type of discourse was unearthed chiefly through the ERIC system, in the form of journal articles and research reports. Since our primary purpose was to concentrate on extant instruments developed from school effectiveness research, rather than with the process of labeling a school "effective", that related literature is not reviewed, but the articles and reports are listed in an annotated bibliography.

The second type of literature we discovered when we asked about school effectiveness was the writing on identifying school-level or classroom-level process characteristics associated with effective schools. This literature addressed the process of discovering in-building factors associated with an effective school. This writing most often took the form of technical reports or papers presented at professional conferences. Many instruments were developed and included for these purposes, serving as data collection devices for research studies. Since these were not our major interest either, the sources we found are also listed in an annotated bibliography.

The third type of literature, (which is much more difficult to

discover) is the body of writing on instruments developed a posteriori to and based upon the school effectiveness research. This was the literature of greatest interest to us, since our primary objective was to locate, collect, describe and critique measures (i.e., questionnaires, interview protocols, and observation guides) that had items measuring the presence of previously identified characteristics of an effective classroom or school. These measures have been developed and used by state departments of education, school districts, universities, research centers and educational laboratories. They are designed primarily for school self-assessment, and are usually embedded in a larger school improvement program.

Most of this third type of literature has not been submitted to the ERIC system. These measures were discovered by word of mouth. One source led us to another source. We asked of each, "Do you have an instrument that measures school effectiveness?" In almost all of the 25-30 sources queried, they did. However, others' interpretations of "school effectiveness instruments" differed from ours, resulting in stacks of a fourth type of literature, whatever these sources called "school effectiveness instruments." These instruments included descriptions of assessment programs (e.g., standardized and criterion-referenced or district-composed tests) and school climate measures. None of these were based directly and exclusively on the school effectiveness research findings. Since we spent a great deal of time sorting through these, and because these do represent examples of what is considered by some as "school effectiveness instrumentation", they are listed in an annotated bibliography.

During the collection process, we alternate. in our thinking.

First we believed that few of the kind of instruments we wanted did exist. Then, after many telephone calls across the nation, we believed that numerous instruments existed. Finally, we now believe that few measures do exist and that they reflect various stages of development; some instruments are in stages of being piloted, some are being revised, some are being validated. We also believe that we have gathered the best and most frequently used ones, if not all of them.

The school effectiveness instruments we found were reviewed using a structured critique format. This format was designed by asking our State Policy Task Force members what they would like to know about each instrument, as well as incorporating our own curiosities. The format includes information on reliability, validity, content, and structure. The instrument reviews are presented on the critique forms for the sake of uniformity and readability.

The results of this project (reported herein) should make a direct contribution to both the researcher and the practitioner. The critique report represents the first critical listing of what is actually available for school-level study of the presence of process variables identified by the research on school effectiveness.

The report is organized into five sections:

Section	I	Introduction
Section	II	Effective Schools Measures Description and Critique Reports
Section	III	Annotated Bibliography of Related Instruments
Section	IV	Bibliography of Related Literature on School Effectiveness
Section	V	Instruments in Preparation

Copies may be obtained from:

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory
2600 S. Parker Rd., Bldg. 5, Suite 353
Aurora, CO 80014

SECTION I

Introduction

This review was begun by asking two questions: "What is an effective school?" and "How is an effective school measured?" These questions led us to three types of literature. The first type is the "How to" literature--the numerous articles and reports on how to identify an effective school. This literature addresses issues and criticisms involved in defining an effective school - for example, the limitations of using achievement test scores as sole criteria for labeling one school effective and another ineffective. This type of discourse was unearthed chiefly through the ERIC system, in the form of journal articles and research reports. Since our primary purpose was to concentrate on extant instruments developed from school effectiveness research, rather than with the process of labeling a school "effective", this related literature is not reviewed, but the articles and reports are listed in Section IV of this report.

The second type of literature we discovered when we asked about school effectiveness is the writing on identifying school-level or classroom-level process characteristics associated with effective schools. This literature addresses the process of discovering in-building factors associated with an effective school. This writing most often takes the form of technical reports or papers presented at professional conferences. Many instruments were developed and included for these purposes, serving as data collection devices for research studies. Since these were not our major interest either, the sources we found are also listed in Section IV.

The third type of literature, (which is much more difficult to

discover) is the body of writing on instruments developed a posteriori to and based upon the school effectiveness research. This was the literature of greatest interest to us, since our primary objective was to locate, collect, describe and critique measures (i.e., questionnaires, interview protocols, and observation guides) that had items measuring the presence of previously identified characteristics of an effective classroom or school. These measures have been developed and used by state departments of education, school districts, universities, research centers and educational laboratories. They are designed primarily for school self-assessment, and are usually embedded in a larger school improvement program.

Most of this third type of literature has not been submitted to the ERIC system. These measures were discovered by word of mouth. One source led us to another source. We asked of each, "Do you have an instrument that measures school effectiveness?" In almost all of the 25-30 sources queried, they did. However, others' interpretations of "school effectiveness instruments" differed from ours, resulting in stacks of a fourth type of literature, whatever these sources called "school effectiveness instruments." These instruments included descriptions of assessment programs (e.g., standardized and criterion-referenced or district-composed tests) and school climate measures. None of these were based directly and exclusively on the school effectiveness research findings. Since we spent a great deal of time sorting through these, and because these do represent examples of what is considered by some as "school effectiveness instrumentation", they are listed in an annotated bibliography included in Section III.

During this collection process, we alternated in our thinking.

First we believed that few of the kind of instruments we wanted did exist. Then, after many telephone calls across the nation, we believed that numerous instruments existed. Finally, we now believe that few measures do exist and that they reflect various stages of development; some instruments are in stages of being piloted, some are being revised, some are being validated. We also believe that we have gathered the best and most frequently used ones, if not all of them.

The school effectiveness instruments we found were reviewed using a structured critique format. This format was designed by asking our State Policy Task Force members what they would like to know about each instrument, as well as incorporating our own curiosities. The format includes information on reliability, validity, content, and structure. The instrument reviews are presented on the critique forms for the sake of uniformity and readability.

The results of this project (reported herein) should make a direct contribution to both the researcher and the practitioner. The critique reports represent the first critical listing of what is actually available for school-level study of the presence of process variables identified by the research on school effectiveness. The majority of our contacts have requested a copy of this final report when completed. Our State Policy Task Force and local practitioners are also interested in adapting or adopting the best of the lot (where possible) for LEA and SEA purposes.

This report is organized into five sections:

Section I Introduction

Section II Effective Schools Measures Description and Critique Reports

Section III Annotated Bibliography of Related Instruments

Section IV Bibliography of Related Literature on School Effectiveness

Section V Instruments in Preparation

Section II

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES

DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORTS

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES - DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Building Level Effectiveness Survey/Classroom Level Effectiveness Survey (2 separate instruments)

2. Authors:

   Contact person: Ronald Smith, Goal-based Education Program, Research Associate, Northwest Regional Lab.

3. Institution:

   Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon; contracted by Alaska Dept. of Education (assisted by individuals from cooperating institutions, i.e., SWRL, Center for School Improvement, etc.).

4. Format and Components:

   Likert type questionnaires: Self-report Building Level questionnaire to be completed by "a principal, leadership team or whole school staff." Administration time = 1-1/2 hrs.: Classroom level questionnaire completed by teachers = 30-45 min. Administration time. Could be used with either elementary or secondary.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Not "Stand alone" instruments: embedded in a larger school improvement framework. NW Lab does not recommend instrument use out of context. Review of existing instructional program - not for individual teacher analysis.

6. Reliability Information:

   No reliability study conducted.

7. Validation Information:

   Assume content validity - no content validation completed or attempted.

8. Distribution Permission:

   Draft Status: not for distribution: NW Regional Lab developed for Alaska State Dept. of Education under contract.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   Instructions for administration (2)
   Scoring guide (2)
   Rating Summary produces a rating graph for 13 or 17 subsections

NW Regional Lab

Self-scorable by building level personnel
1000 pages of training materials

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Both questionnaires tabulate responses on a frequency basis, in Likert format. The response categories range from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always." Each of the two questionnaires can be completed by teachers; it is assumed that teachers will have completed the building level questionnaire prior to completing the classroom level questionnaire.

The building level questionnaire contains 57 items in forced choice, Likert format; 13 categories or variables are represented according to NW's scoring instructions. The largest categories represented are: 1) Expectations, 2) Incentives and Recognition, and 3) Instructional Issues (diagnosis, prescription, matching objectives and curriculum); use of time and monitoring staff performance also have relatively heavy coverage by items. The questionnaire does not seem to be slanted towards either elementary or secondary. Specific item # breakdown included.

The classroom level effectiveness questionnaire contains 83 items in forced choice, Likert format. Many of the same items (phrased a bit differently) as the building level questionnaire are included. 17 categories or "Clusters" are represented (according to NW's scoring instructions). Fewer questions focus on expectations; largest clusters include 1) Objectives for instruction, and 2) Instructional procedures (strategies and resources). Specific item # breakdown attached.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

Both the response categories and the items contribute to specific problems with these questionnaires. Response categories are not all-inclusive. Usually, Likert type responses range from "Never" to "Always"; these ranged from "Almost Never" to "Almost Always", thus excluding some possibilities. Also, what is the difference between "Rarely" and "Almost Never"? Response intervals are not evenly proportioned.

Problems are also inherent in both the content and the structure of the items. First, all items are slanted in a positive manner (presumably for ease in scoring) which produces response bias. Second, the items do not necessarily reflect a direct correspondence to the findings from school effectiveness studies; i.e., #47 on the classroom level (using advance organizers), #11 (tips to parents with homework assignments), etc. Although these may be considered by most to be good educational practice, there is no 1-1 correspondence to this body of research. Third, some items that are considered positive-#9, #10 - setting objectives to be met

NW Regional Lab

by calendar date, matching objectives to test items (shouldn't this be the other way around?) are not necessarily positive practices. The classroom level questionnaire did not address direct instruction frequency or varying group arrangements (small vs. whole group). Fourth, the concepts or clusters are represented in several cases by a small number of items (i.e., 2 items for "Use of Assessment Data"). Fifth, some of the items are "double-barreled"; several questions are really checking two sets of related, but different behaviors.

Both instruments are easy to read, follow, and mark responses. Tallies and averages can be completed at the school level by district personnel. Easy to score and graph.

Classroom Level Effectiveness Survey: Scoring Instructions

There are seventeen practice clusters in the Classroom Level Effectiveness Questionniare which will be used to summarize the results:

PRACTICE CLUSTER	ITEM NUMBERS	TOTAL ITEMS
Learning Objectives	#1-10	10
Resources & Materials	#11-17	7
Instructional Strategies	#18-24	7
Expectations for Behavior	#25-27	3
Routines and Procedures	#28-34	7
Classroom Behavior	#35-41	7
Expectations for Learning	#42-43	2
Placement and Grouping	#44-45	2
Stage Setting	#46-48	2
Instruction	#49-56	8
Use of Time	#57-64	8
Review and Reteaching	#65-66	2
Student/Teacher Interaction	#67-68	2
Incentives and Recognition	#69-76	8
Assessment/Alignment	#77-78	2
Assessment/Procedures	#79-80	2
Use of Assessment Data	#81-83	2

You will prepare one rating for each cluster. Follow these steps.

1. For all the combined items in a practice cluster, count the number of ratings in each of the possible response categories. For example, if ten people complete the survey, the responses for cluster on Expectations for Learning (3 items) may be distributed like this:

Building Level Effectiveness Survey: Scoring Instructions

You will now compile responses and create a graph rating practice clusters covered in the Building Level Effectiveness Survey. There are thirteen practice clusters in the Building Level Effectiveness Questionnaire, listed below:

PRACTICE CLUSTER	ITEM NUMBERS	TOTAL ITEMS
Learning Objectives	#1-4	4
Resources & Materials	#5-9	5
Instructional Strategies	#10-11	2
Expectations/Student Learning	#12-13	2
Expectations/Social Behavior	#14-21	8
Expectations/Staff	#22-24	3
Use of Time	#25-31	7
Incentives and Recognition	#32-43	12
Parent Involvement	#44-45	2
Assessment/Alignment	#46-47	2
Assessment/Procedures	#48-49	2
Use of Assessment Data	#50-51	2
Monitoring Staff Performance	#52-57	6

These practice clusters will be used to summarize questionnaire results. You will prepare one rating for each cluster. Follow these steps:

1. For all the combined items in a practice cluster, count the number of ratings in each of the possible response categories. For example, if ten people complete the survey, the responses for the cluster on Expectations for Learning (3 items) may be distributed like this:

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   School Learning Climate
   Assessment Instrument

2. Authors:

   W.B. Brookover

3. Institution:

   Michigan State University

4. Format and Components:

   52 item Likert-type forced-choice response questionnaire.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   For school staff to assess the school learning climate.

6. Reliability Information:

   None available at present.

7. Validation Information:

   Validation to distinguish between high achieving schools and low achieving schools.
   Michigan and Tennessee - complete validation procedures and information to be sent when completed.

8. Distribution Permission:

   "Skeleton instrument" - will be revised to exclude items #1 and #18 (no validation).

9. Supplemental Materials:

   Scoring directions

Michigan State U.

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Likert-type questionnaire (52 items).
Addresses:
1) Administrative Instructional Leadership (17 items).
2) Teacher Rewards (5 items).
3) Emphasis on Achievement (7 items).
4) Safe & Orderly Environment (10 items).
5) Expectations and Evaluations of Students (7 items).
6) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program (8 items).

Items do seem to measure those categories on surface glance.

Does not specify elementary or secondary: could perhaps be used at both levels.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

Items are stated both positively and negatively. Response categories have even intervals. Measures behavior (latter section) and beliefs (first section): 8 belief items; 44 behavior items. Directions for self-scoring at the school level.

Large number of items per construct should yield greater reliability than other questionnaires. Questionnaire covers only 5 areas. Excludes information about diagnostic-prescriptive approach to instruction, use of time (allocated, engaged or successfully engaged) and other relevant categories to effective schools.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

Delaware School Improvement Monitoring Process

1) Staff Questionnaire
2) Program and Building Observation
3) Support Staff Interview
4) Teacher Interview
5) Principal Interview
6) Document Review

2. Authors:

Contact: Sid Collsin, Delaware State Dept. of Education

3. Institution:

Delaware Department of Public Instruction
Instruction Division - and -
Delaware State Board of Education

4. Format and Components:

Observation and interview guides and questionnaire based upon Delaware's 11 program standards, most of which relate closely to the Effective Schools literature. RBS assessed in formulating these standards.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

For school self-assessment as bases for improvement plan.

6. Reliability Information:

None.

7. Validation Information:

None

8. Distribution Permission:

Limited.

9. Supplemental Materials:

1) 16 monographs for teachers on topics such as Parent Involvement, Better Discipline Through Higher Expectations, etc.
2) Planning Handbook for School Improvement.
3) Program Standards for Delaware schools.
4) Delaware's Plan for Goal-Directed and Performance-Based Instruction.
5) Flowchart of School Improvement Monitoring Process.
6) Elements of Effective Instruction by Bill McCormick.
7) List of Documents for Review.

Delaware

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Principal (18 questions), Teacher (15 questions), and support staff interviews (11 questions) are open-ended questions given to the interviewee prior to the interview. The teacher interviewee is asked to bring appropriate documentation to the interview, such as example 1 of retained students' work and lesson plans. Principals and support staff are not required to do this. Each question is identified as relative to one of the 11 standards. The 11 standards are as follows:

1. The school has a stated philosophy accompanied by school goals.
2. The school has a planned program supported by staff, that follows the school's philogophy goals and identified priorities for improvement.
3. The principal administers and supervises the school's program.
4. There are written curricula that address the nine educational goals for Delaware and contain instructional objectives for all subjects.
5. Pre/post assessment and analysis of each student's needs are integral parts of instruction.
6. Learning activities are designed to accomplish the instructional objectives of each curriculum.
7. The management of classrooms and other instructional areas facilitates learning.
8. The school climate is conducive to learning and positive human interaction.
9. Programs and services for meeting the special needs and interests of students are well-defined and coordinated with the school's instructional program.
10. There is a written promotion policy in operation which states performance criteria for assigning students to instructional levels and includes a plan for providing remedial instruction.
11. Staff members are trained, assigned, and supervised.

These standards were based on case studies conducted by the Delaware Dept. of Public Instruction on Effective Schools and the body of literature on effective schools.

The staff questionnaire is administered in preparation for the monitoring visit. It contains 11 open-ended questions related to the 11 standards. Document review and building observation checklists are similarly constructed.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

There are several inherent weaknesses in the Delaware measures. First, the interviews seem to be very time-consuming to conduct with staff, particularly in asking for documentation. Also, some resistance could be anticipated on the part of teachers in complying with proving their statements by sharing lesson plans, retained students' work, etc. Tabulating open-ended responses to the questionnaire and compiling that information together with the teacher interviews (also open-ended) would be another extremely time-consuming task in the process.

Delaware

Finally, there are relatively few questions per category (or standard). These are very broad questions which may need additional probes to complete.

Strengths of the process design include the monographs listing "Did you know that?" statements and verification from the research for educational practices. The Planning Handbook for School Improvement explicates the component development model for change.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

The Connecticut Secondary School Development questionnaire, and Secondary School Development Process student questionnaire, and Student Achievement Profile

2. Authors:

Alice Evans and William Gauthier, Jr.

3. Institution:

Connecticut State Dept. of Education
Contact: William Gauthier, Jr.
(In conjunction with the Northwest Regional Exchange)

4. Format and Components:

3 components:
Two Questionnaires and Achievement Profile
Three forms of Student Questionnaire
Two forms of Secondary School Development Questionnaire

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

School Assessment; basis for improvement plan

6. Reliability Information:

Plans for internal consistency Reliability, Stability Reliability. Has only been in use for six months.

7. Validation Information:

None Enclosed.

8. Distribution Permission:

Research Edition, copyright 1983. Not to be reproduced without permission.

9. Supplemental Materials:

(See Elementary Edition Critique)
Student Achievement Profile

Connecticut S.D.E.

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The Student Achievement Profile (separate from Instruments) is based on Edmonds' definition of an effective school--one in which the proportion of low income students attaining the minimum mastery of basic skills is the same as the proportion of other students' attaining minimum mastery. The Achievement Profile gathers three types of information:

1. A measure of achievement in reading, language arts, and mathematics for each student (standardized test results).
2. An index of social class for each student (free lunch count, parents' occupation or education).
3. A criterion designation for minimum mastery (school staff make this decision - example uses 30th percentile criterion level).

Data are plotted on horizontal axis (percentile rank by 10 points intervals) by income level (high, average, low) on the vertical axis. Achievement data for each of the basic skills are displayed for each grade level tested.

Each form of the student questionnaire (3 forms) contains 50 items. No description accompanied the questionnaire. A Likert scale format was used with response categories ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." Some negatively stated items included. Several items don't appear to be directly related to the Effective Schools Research (e.g., #3, 9, 15, 16, 50 - Form 1). (Reviewed 2 different Form 1's).

The secondary school development questionnaire contains 100 items - same format - intended for staff. Two forms exist.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

No enclosed written information concerning the school level student questionnaires. Data displays show bar graphs and percent of responses in each response category for each item.

This series will need updated information on reliability and validity when completed and available from the Connecticut State Department.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES - DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

The Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire (elementary)
Secondary School Development Questionnaire, Student Questionnaire.

2. Authors:

Elementary: Robert Villanova and William Gauthier, C. Patrick Proctor, Joan Shoemaker, Herman Sirois, Martin Gotowala.
Secondary: William Gauthier and Alice Evans.

3. Institution:

Connecticut State Department of Education (in conjunction with the Northwest Regional Exchange).

4. Format and Components:

Elementary and Secondary Multiple Methods of Data Collection.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

For school self-analysis: as basis for an action plan for school improvement, formed by a task force from the building and facilitated by data collectors.

6. Reliability Information:

Some construct scales have low inter-rater reliabilities and are in need of further revision. Generally high inter-rater reliabilities for interview category classifications. Will be repiloted, Spring '82 - plans for internal consistency reliability, stability and factor analysis of questionnaire.

7. Validation Information:

Interview content validity assessed by panel of experts who sorted items into categories; recommended exclusion or modification; then piloted on 6 teachers and administrators. Questionnaire content validity established by 1) judges' agreement and 2) independent classification of items to categories. Piloted on 6 teachers.

8. Distribution Permission:

Research Edition - not to be reproduced without permission.
Copyrighted.
Send for Robert Villanova's dissertation establishing reliability and validity.

Connecticut

9. Supplemental Materials:

1. Monograph: Instructionally Effective Schools: A Model and a Process
2. Elementary Interview (45 min. Administration Time)
3. Elementary questionnaire
4. Secondary faculty questionnaire
5. Secondary student questionnaire
6. Elementary data display
7. Secondary data display

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Half a schools' faculty are interviewed using Connecticut School Effectiveness interview (elementary, 67 items) probing 7 school effectiveness characteristics. These are:

1. Safe and orderly environment (5 items)
2. Clear school mission (11 items)
3. Instructional Leadership (14 items)
4. High expectations (10 items)
5. Opportunity to learn and student time-on-task (9 items)
6. Frequent monitoring of pupil progress (8 items)
7. Home-school relations (10 items)

In other half of schools, faculty respond to the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire (100 items) measuring the 7 characteristics. The interview is highly structured with directions to interviewers (who are trained). The questions are open-ended at the conclusion, asking interviewee to identify the schools' strengths and weaknesses. A forced choice set of responses (ranging from extremely positive to extremely negative) is used by the interviewer to classify subjects' responses. Comments are also recorded if response includes other information. Items focus specifically on reading and math instructional conduct in Category II. Many of the items are very similar in content to Brookover's instrument. A scoring guide for the interviewer allows ranking of response on a 1-5 basis.

The elementary questionnaire is a 100 item Likert scale with response categories ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." One in every 7 items is reverse scored (i.e., stated negatively). Categorical items are not grouped together, but scattered randomly throughout the questionnaire. The items appear to have a strong correspondence to the school effectiveness research at an appropriate level of generality.

Connecticut

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

Based on a modification of the New York School Improvement Project. Also used to gather an Achievement Profile by gathering student achievement data by student economic class subset and archival data (report cards, student handbooks, mastery skill checklists). Input from Michael Cohen was used who suggested interview and observation techniques.

These instruments are a portion of a multi-trait, multi-method assessment process. Plans for technical manual of sophisticated validation and reliability procedures from Robert Villanova's dissertation have been developed.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Reliability Estimates for the Factor Categories on Connecticut's School Effectiveness Questionnaire

Factor Categories*	Number of Items**	Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability
Safe and Orderly	13	.90
Leadership	23	.94
Clear School Mission	11	.84
Home/School Relations	12	.86

*Factor Method: orthogonal solution-varimax.

*Factor names were devised from judgemental interpretations of the loadings.

**Number of items reflect items that loaded .35 and better.

Note: this is a preliminary analyses, further analyses will be forthcoming.

Wang 2751H

Phone:
Box 2219 • Hartford, Connecticut 06115

An Equal Opportunity Employer

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Reliability Estimates for the Judgemental Categories
Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire

Categories	Number of items	Alpha Internal Consistency Reliabilities	Test-Retest* Reliabilities
Safe and Orderly Environment	15	.87	.85
Clear School Mission	14	.90	.90
Instructional Leadership	25	.93	.83
Expectations	12	.55	.69
Opportunity to Learn	12	.66	.74
Monitoring Student Progress	12	.77	.67
Home/School Relations	10	.89	.82

Total N=423

*Test/Retest reliability was generated using only one school.

Phone:
Box 2219 • Hartford, Connecticut 06115
An Equal Opportunity Employer

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Reliability Estimates for the Judgemental Categories on the Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview

Categories	Number of Items	Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability
Safe and Orderly Environment	5	.66
Clear School Mission	11	.93
Instructional Leadership	14	.81
Expectations	10	.69
Opportunity to learn	9	.78
Monitoring Student Progress	8	.86
Home/School Relations	10	.66

Total N=423

Wang 2751H

Phone:
Box 2219 • Hartford, Connecticut 06115

An Equal Opportunity Employer

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

(8 questionnaires)

1) Pupil Information Profile
2) Pupil Statistical Questionnaire (to be completed by the teacher).
3) The Teacher Questionnaire
4) The Teacher Statistical Questionnaire
5) The Principal Statistical Questionnaire
7) Teacher Aide Statistical Questionnaire
8) School Site Survey

2. Authors:

Contact: Gilbert R. Austin
University of Maryland

3. Institution:

Maryland State Dept. of Education
Maryland University of Baltimore

4. Format and Components:

Statistical Questionnaires collect background data; e.g., age, years experience, number and kind of degrees held; other questionnaires measure attitudes; school site survey collected factual information - physical plant, resources, curriculum, PTA, etc.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

Designed for process evaluation to distinguish differences in process characteristics between high achieving and low achieving schools - elementary level - (exploratory).

6. Reliability Information:

Student and Teacher questionnaires
Test-Retest (stability) Reliability
(detailed technical report not included)

7. Validation Information:

None available.

8. Distribution Permission:

Contact University of Maryland

Maryland S.D.E.
Maryland U.-Baltimore

9. Supplemental Materials:

1) ERIC document ED160 644 "Process Evaluation: A Comprehensive Study of Authors"
2) "Characteristics of Effective Schools", Gil Austin and Phyllis Utterback
3) Executive Summary
4) "Exemplary Schools and their Identification", New Directions for Testing and Measurement, 10, 1981, pp. 31-41.

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The items on all the questionnaires fell into two categories: 1) those items to which a subject responded on a bi-polar Likert-type scale (some stated positively, some negatively) which produced ordinal data; 2) those to which subjects responded by choosing a discrete category, producing nominal data. Many of the questions were taken from studies done under James Coleman by the U.S. Office of Education, Ralph Tyler, John Flanagan in Project Talent, the California Study of Educational Progress, the New York Study on Production Functions and a locally developed student questionnaire I.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

These questionnaires (and observation instruments part II) were developed (or used) to identify distinguishing factors or process characteristics associated with identified high and low achieving schools. These were exploratory in nature and not developed to be used as a self-assessment tool for a school to compare itself on the variables associated with effective schools.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

Reciprocal Category - System (RCS), and
Teacher Practice Observation Record (TPOR)

2. Authors:

Contact: Gil Austin
University of Maryland

3. Institution:

Maryland State Dept. of Education
University of Maryland

4. Format and Components:

RCS is a modification of the Flanders Verbal Interaction System (Student-teacher Verbal Interaction).
TPOR is an instrument for systematically observing teachers' behavior.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

Guide for classroom observation as basis to distinguish systematic differences in processes between high and low achieving classrooms. Used to aggregate data at the school level not classroom level.

6. Reliability Information:

Feasible to train observers with acceptable reliability - however, reliability coefficients not reported.

7. Validation Information:

None provided - used extant instruments developed by external researchers.

8. Distribution Permission:

Contact authors of RCS and TPOR.

9. Supplemental Materials:

None

Maryland S.D.E., U. of Maryland

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The Reciprocal Category System (RCS) is a modification of the Flanders; it was developed by Dr. Ober of the University of South Florida. An equal number of categories are assigned for teachers' and students' talk. The RCS System looks only at talk and classifies all talk into 10 categories of 1) norms (informalizes) the climate, 2) accepts, 3) amplifies the contributions of another, 4) elicits, 5) responds, 6) initiates, 7) directs, 8) corrects, 9) cools (formalizes) the climate, and 10) silence or confusion. This information is developed into a score that relates to a score on a verbal continuum from one extreme to another, e.g., "warm" to "cool." Requires 2-2 min. observations.

The Teacher Practices Observation Record (TPOR) records teacher behavior in 7 categories: 1) nature of the situation, 2) nature of the problem, 3) development of ideas, 4) use of subject matter, 5) evaluation, 6) differentiation, 7) motivation control. Scores are developed in each category in addition to a total score which summarizes the degree of child-centeredness for the school. Requires 3-3 minute separate observations within a 20 minute period. The TPOR was also constructed to indicate experimental teaching methods versus a more traditional or conservative approach.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

These classroom observation systems or instruments were used in conjunction with and supplemental to the 8 questionnaires. The Maryland Study found few distinguishable differences between high and low achieving schools from the results of the TPOR. The RCS did reveal great variation, e.g., teachers in high achieving schools gave students more direction, elicited more comments from students and corrected students more frequently than in low achieving schools. Judgements as to how reliable or valid these instruments are cannot be made based on the information provided. The inclusion of classroom observation (another multi-method, multi-trait approach) lends further information but does not triangulate or substantiate the process variables identified by the questionnaires. These observation systems are not developed based upon the effective schools research per se, and were used as exploratory measures to identify characteristics of an effective school.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

Indicators of Quality Schools
Instrument to Assess the Educational Quality of Your School

2. Authors:

Wm. Dean, T. Howard, K. DePew, R. Ewy, J. Harrigan, J. Hennes, T. Knauer, Sr. A. Thomas, G. Villars.

3. Institution:

Colorado State Department of Education, Denver, Colorado.
Contact: Eugene Howard

4. Format and Components:

One questionnaire (42 items, 203 sub-items) to be used K-12. Respondents may be staff members, "informed pupils or parents." One hour administration time.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

Designed to assist a school in identifying areas of strength and areas for improvement in school quality: K-12 use. To be used in a school self-study.

6. Reliability Information:

No psychometric data attempted or reported.

7. Validation Information:

No psychometric data attempted or reported.

8. Distribution Permission:

Available from Colorado State Dept. of Education at cost.

9. Supplemental Materials:

1. Overview
2. User's Guide (including scoring and summary plot)
3. Review of the literature on effective schools

Colorado S.D.E.

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The assessment items are based upon the effective schools literature as well as (according to the User's Guide) "agreed-upon good school practice." (p.1) Respondents code their answers to 42 items (203 sub-items) in 2 categories, "What is?" and "What Impact Potential?" Some of these items are repeated since some activities will have impact on more than one quality indicator.

The questionnaire is organized around three dimensions: I) Student outcomes: achievement & satisfaction, II) School Leadership, Instructional and Institutional Characteristics, III) Accountability Accreditation/Planning Process. Twelve sub-categories are directly assessed: I-1) curricular (13 items) congruence, 2) assessment (17 items), II-3) Principal Leadership (18 items), 4) high expectations (13 items, 5) school-wide norms (9 items), 6) school climate (39 items), 7) monitoring and feedback (11 items), 8) time-on-task (11 items), 9) organization and management (23 items), 10) instructional effectiveness (18 items), III-11) parent and community involvement (14 items), 12) accountability, accreditation, planning (18 items). Can be sub-scored in each area.

The questionnaire measures beliefs about behavior and attitudes toward that behavior. Respondents rank order frequency of present occurrence and impact potential if that activity were present in the school.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

The Quality Schools Indicators, as is typical with school effectiveness instruments, has several major flaws. First, the instrument lacks reliability data or validation data. No psychometric studies have been conducted. Second, not all items are based on school effectiveness literature, but are thought to reflect "good educational practice." Third, bias in responses is encouraged by 1) the introductory paragraphs executing what positive conditions are and 2) all items are slanted positively. Fourth, several of the items are double-barreled, measuring two or three separate behaviors. Fifth, some items are more appropriate for one type of respondent than another, e.g., "I like working in this school"--very few parents would be able to answer that item.

It is interesting to note that twice as many items (39) measure school climate as measure any other construct or category. Generally, there are a large number of items per category (unusually large in comparison to other questionnaires), which should increase reliability coefficients in internal consistency.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Elementary Program Review Handbook (84 pgs.)
   Secondary Program Review Handbook (93 pgs.)

2. Authors:

   California State Dept. of Education
   Contact: Walter Denham and/or Dr. Doornek

3. Institution:

   California State Department of Education (Developed over a 10-yr. period; redeveloped in 78-79-80).

4. Format and Components:

   1) Directions to evaluators and for final report
   2) Observation, interview and document guides
   (elementary and secondary editions for 80-81)

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Evaluation criteria established to guide members of a program review team (internal or external) to judge effects of the school program and opportunities for improvement - can be used for peer observation on individual classroom level.

6. Reliability Information:

   None

7. Validation Information:

   None

8. Distribution Permission:

   Contact State Department.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1. Elementary School working papers (quality document and compliance document).
   2. Secondary school working papers (quality document and compliance document).

California State Department of Education

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Each guide lists the area of investigation (e.g., student activities), the primary source of information (e.g., school or classroom observation and/or interviews) and verifying sources of information (e.g., interviews, documents). The guide is quite comprehensive and directive. An example from the guide for collecting information about how students are learning (elementary level) includes guiding questions such as, "To what extent is direct instruction a part of the students' daily instruction?" and "Does the student understand what he or she is expected to do, how to do it, and why?" (p.II-10).

The quality documents and compliance documents focus on opportunities for improvement, e.g., "How Students Are Learning", "What Students Are Learning", "The Environment in Which Learning Takes Place", "Improving Staff Development", and "Improving District Support". These consist of one or two page lists of general suggestions, such as (under "Improving Staff Development") "h. allocate sufficient time for staff development activities", "d. set priorities for group and individual staff development." Many of these suggestions are duplicated between elementary and secondary levels. Its primary purpose is program evaluation, not building assessment.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

In a definitive sense, this is not an instrument based solely on the effective schools research developed as an assessment device for measuring the presence of those characteristics. The criterion standards are bulky, extensive and represent a program or package rather than a tool. Although excerpts could be used (particular potential for peer observation using 1 criteria at classroom level) for initial looks at a schools' program, the entire package of guides is so exhaustive as to prohibit external use to measure school effectiveness in other states' districts.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES - DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   2nd Edition, New York City School Improvement Project Assessment Instruments: 1)* Principal Interview Form, 2)* Asst. Principal Interview Form, 3)* Classroom Instructional Staff Interview Form A & B, 5)* Classroom Teacher Questionnaire, 6) Special Program Instructional Staff Interview Form, 7) Special Program Teacher Questionnaire, 8) Para Interview Form, 9) Auxiliary Staff Interview Form, 10) Parent Interview Form, 11) Building and Grounds Observational Assessment.

   *=Reviewed

2. Authors:

   1980, Board of Education of the City of New York.

3. Institution:

   New York City Public Schools
   Contact: Anthony J. Alvardo

4. Format and Components:

   11 components including questionnaires, interview guides (2 forms each) and observation instrument.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   To be used as a needs assessment system for school improvement effort.

6. Reliability Information:

   None

7. Validation Information:

   Unknown

8. Distribution Permission:

   Must submit written request to Chancellor for permission to reprint: must acknowledge source.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   NOTE: Supplemental information is still pending from NY City Public Schools.

New York City Public Schools

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The Classroom Teacher Questionnaire is 13 pages in length. Teachers are queried using a combination of forced-choice and open-ended response formats. The items include queries concerning reading and math methods and approaches, goals and objectives, coordination of instruction, observations, lesson plans, communication, supervision, inservice resources, parent-teacher relations, admin.-teacher relations, expectations, climate testing and progress reports. Questionnaire is self-administered, containing approximately 4-6 questions per topic.

The Classroom Instructional Staff Interview is 9 pages in length. The questions are all open-ended (some require a yes-no response but ask for elaboration). The questions are almost exactly the same as the teacher questionnaires, but phrased differently.

The Principal Interview Form consists of 8 pages of open-ended questions. The items cover topics such as supervisory and administrative methods, perceptions of effectiveness with staff and parents, communication, goals and objectives, expectations, school-wide curriculum, reading, math and writing approaches, basic skills instruction resources and programs, mandated time for coordination of instruction, innovative instruction encouragement, staff characteristics, student behavior, school climate (i.e., safety), parent support, testing, diagnosis, teaching by objective, individualized instruction and school strengths and weaknesses. Few questions (1-3) measure each category.

The Assistant Principal Interview Form asks almost all the same questions (sometimes phrased differently) as the Principal Interview.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

These 4 instruments appear to be based directly upon the school effectiveness research. The open-ended response formats lead to difficulties, as well as strengths, in several ways. First, data analysis would be cumbersome, requiring tabulation of lengthy responses. Second, this type of data does not produce neat bar graphs or scoring ease to show discrepancies or agreement between and among respondents. Third, no information is available on construct validation. Reliability and validity studies were most likely never conducted, due to format.

The greatest strengths of the teacher and principal assessment forms are: 1) the content of the questions, and 2) the triangulation provided by asking similar or exact same questions of each type of respondent. Many of the questions are designed to "double check" or provide a kind of reflexivity concerning what actually occurs within a school by matching self-perceptions with others' perceptions.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

New Jersey Education Association School Effectiveness Training Program: 1) Teacher Questionnaire, 2) Student Survey, 3) SET Institute Evaluation, 4) NEA Teacher Needs Assessment Survey.

2. Authors:

Produced by NJEA Instruction
Contact: Norman Goldman, NJEA

3. Institution:

New Jersey Education Association
in collaboration with Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1981.

4. Format and Components:

Inservice Education Handout Packet and embedded 60 item questionnaire (NEA Teacher Needs Assessment Survey).

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

Brief Needs Assessment as basis for Action planning in Inservice program used on school by school basis.

6. Reliability Information:

7. Validation Information:

Piloted in 1978.

8. Distribution Permission:

Contact New Jersey Education Assoc. or RBS.

9. Supplemental Materials:

1) SET School Contact Form
2) SET School Site Report Form
3) Staff Development Planning Worksheet
4) Action Planning
5) Factors in Problem-solving
6) A Problem-solving Program for Defining a Problem and Planning Action

New Jersey Education Assoc.

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The NEA Instructional Staff Questionnaire requests 2 responses to each of the 60 items. One is "what should be" - with response categories ranging from "never" to "always". The other response required is "what is".

This is one of 4 or 5 extant instruments which have been updated. The new information and questionnaires are currently being forwarded to McREL.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Profile of School Excellence
   Assessment Package: 7 different data sources
   Protocols and questionnaires

2. Authors:

   Jack Sanders
   AEL
   1983

3. Institution:

   Appalachian Educational Laboratory

4. Format and Components:

   Assesses school effectiveness variables, using protocols and questionnaires designed for teachers, principals, students. Superintendent interview, central office staff.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   For diagnosis at district and school level: used as part of AEL's assessment/prescription service.

6. Reliability Information:

   Average interrater reliability .92.

7. Validation Information:

   Validated by expert judgement - authority model pilot-tested. Disc-'minated among high and low-achieving schools.

8. Distribution Permission:

   Will not release for examination; private non-NIE product. Purchase only. Corporation. Copyrighted. McREL does not have this instrumentation.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1) Data form
   2) Graphic profiles (bar graph, perceptions)
   3) Report to superintendent
      a. vignette on each school
      b. recommendations to district

Appalachian Educational Laboratory

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Questionnaires are administered on a random basis to 10% of districts' students, Grades 7-12 and 50% of teachers at all grade levels. Each participating principal is interviewed on site.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

No comments can be made since actual instrumentation was not shared with McREL. Information in critique report came from oral telephone conversation and 1-page abstract.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   School Improvement Questionnaire (SIQ)

2. Authors:

   Bob Ewy, Larry Hutchins, Susan Everson, Ann Riley

3. Institution:

   Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

4. Format and Components:

   Questionnaire - consisting of 73 items answered on a Likert scale: always true, usually true, sometimes true, never true, don't know. Responses are recorded on a sense-mark score sheet which is machine-scored.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   To measure the perceptions of faculties and principals concerning their engagement in behaviors or activities which are associated with effective schools.

6. Reliability Information:

   None to date - however, data are being collected for a test-retest reliability study and an estimation of internal consistency of the category scores.

7. Validation Information:

   None to date - A discriminate validity study and a factor analysis are planned.

8. Distribution Permission:

   May not be used unless purchased from McREL.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   A technical manual is being written.

McREL

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The 73 items (94 on the principal/administrator version) are scored in the following 15 improvement areas:

# of items 73	94	
7	10	Diagnosing student needs The items in this area refer to the activities that teachers, principals, administrators undertake to determine what the students need to learn, and what the appropriate instructional techniques are for teaching them.
6	9	Prescribing instructional outcomes The items in this area refer to the explication and communication of instructional objectives and expected outcomes by teachers to students, district to teachers and school to community.
7	8	Communicating expectations of success This area comprises items that indicate that teachers and administrators communicate the belief that all students can and will succeed.
6	7	Giving student responsibility for independent learning In this area, items are included that describe the ways in which students and teachers are given autonomy and responsibility for their own activities.
9	10	Providing effective, interactive instruction The items in this area provide information about the extent to which faculty and staff use effective teaching strategies and are supported in this effort by administrators.
7	9	Providing time for academic activities This area contains items that assess whether students and teachers are given sufficient time to complete tasks, how well they use that time, and if they are successful on the tasks they complete.
6	11	Providing knowledge of outcomes and feedback In this area, the items refer to the ways in which progress toward goals is monitored and communicated to the students, teachers, district, and community.

McREL

5	6	Providing success experiences, rewards, and praise The items in this area describe the way in which students' and teachers' accomplishments are acknowledged and encouraged.
9	16	Creating a positive school climate This area includes items that determine how the teachers and administrators are involved in creating a school environment that is safe, clean, predictable, pleasant, and conducive to learning.
9	9	Creating cooperation and collegiality among faculty and staff These items refer to the ways in which personal concern and support are provided to teachers by each other and by administrators.
6	6	Soliciting parental support The items in this area describe the ways that the school encourages and develops good school-parent and school-community relations.
25	25	Teachers This area contains all items that refer to activities and behaviors conducted by teachers across all the first eleven areas.
37	59	Environment This area contains all items that refer to resources (physical, educational, and psychological) and policies that develop and support the other areas.
11	11	Leadership This area contains all items that refer to activities and policies that take place at the school level across the other areas.
11	11	Principals This area contains all the items that refer specifically to activities and behaviors in which the principal engages across the other areas.

The SIQ is generally completed by all the faculty members in the schools that are involved in training. Results of the SIQ are reported in two forms for each improvement area. One is the comparison of the teachers' and principals' average scores. This is presented in a graph

form to make it easier to understand. The second is the distribution of responses, average score, and disagreement among respondents for each item on the SIS. Team members from schools participating in McREL's Effective Schools Program are given instruction in interpreting these results and incorporating them into their school improvement plans. The SIS is generally administered before the training for all faculty in participating schools, and after the training for team members. In some cases, however, the post-measure has been taken with non-ESP participants as well.

This instrument is currently being revised. The new version will be retitled and include forms for teachers, principals, parents and students. The reliability and validity data being collected is for the new instrument.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Academic Efficiency Index

2. Authors:

   R. Marzano and C.L. Hutchins

3. Institution:

   Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory

4. Format and Components:

   a) worksheet for estimating out of class time use and absenteeism.
   b) observation instruments for determining classroom non-instructional and instructional time along with student engagement during instructional time.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   a) As a tool with which schools may assess their use of time in and out of class.
   b) As a staff development tool to be used within a coaching model.

6. Reliability Information:

   .85 inter-rater reliability with one half-day training.

7. Validation Information:

   None available at present.

8. Distribution Permission:

   Limited.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   Training generally necessary for accurate use of the instrument.

McREL

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Data regarding the following areas are first gathered:

a) Time spent per day in scheduled non-instructional activities:
   e.g. lunch
   recess
   break between classes
   assemblies

b) Average absentee rate per day

c) Average time spent per day in non-instructional "in-class" activities.
   e.g. beginning managerial activities
   ending managerial activities
   socializing
   disciplining
   interruptions

d) Student engagement.

e) Student success.

These data are then combined to form indices which measure:

a) Proportion of school day devoted to scheduling.
b) Proportion of school day lost to absenteeism.
c) Proportion of school log deviated to non-instructional in-class activities.
d) Proportion of school day lost to student inattentiveness.
e) Proportion of school day in which students are engaged.
f) Proportion of school day lost to student lack of success.
g) Proportion of school day devoted to academic learning time.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

Data is based on direct observation of instructional practices. The process itself requires that schools/teachers collect objective information about themselves. This appears useful as a staff development exercise.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Achievement Directed Leadership
   Engagement Rate Form

2. Authors:

   David Helms

3. Institution:

   Research for Better Schools

4. Format and Components:

   Form to be completed by outside adult (not the classroom teacher for the class being observed). Required training program.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   To measure engaged time, on task and off task behavior; for use in any content area.

6. Reliability Information:

   unknown.

7. Validation Information:

8. Distribution Permission:

   McREL does not have this instrumentation.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1. Teachers' Guide
   2. Principals' Guide
   3. District Guide
   4. Videotape of classroom behavior/activity

   Time Leaders' Guide
   (Manual)

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Codes each student in 4 categories of off-task behavior or 1 category engaged. If a student is unengaged, a tally mark is made in the appropriate box on the form. No mark is made for engaged students. Scorable by the observer.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Indicators of Quality

2. Authors:

   Wm. Vincent & Jo Casey, 1968.

3. Institution:

   Columbia University
   New York Institute of Administrative Research

4. Format and Components:

   Observation Instrument-Guide

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   To obtain a quantitative measure of school quality for use K-12.

6. Reliability Information:

   Spearman Brown reliability coefficient for total instrument .91. Split halfs reliability coefficient .84 for internal consistency.

7. Validation Information:

   Flanagan's tables from item analysis used to estimate discrimination indices in each of the 102 positive and negative signs. All but one discriminated in expected direction - ranged from +.65 - +.12 for positive item and +.61 - .00 for negative signs.

8. Distribution Permission:

   McREL does not have the instrumentation.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1) ERIC document ED 034 308
   2) Manual
   3) Scoring and Report Service

Columbia University, N.Y. Institute of Admin. Research

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Indicators of Quality is an instrument consisting of 51 polarized items, scorable on a 103-item scale applied to a representative sampling of all class meetings in a school's instructional setting. The procedure is observation of a uniform time span in each location. It requires a 3-day training and trial application period.

The instrument is not available without training at development site. Scores are reported in relation to norms being developed and quality control charts (based on standard score scales) facilitate interpretation.

The behaviors recorded include individualization, interpersonal regard, creativity, and group activity.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Checklist for Effective Schools

2. Authors:

   Richard Hirsh

3. Institution:

   Reported in Instructor, 1982.
   University of Oregon.

4. Format and Components:

   Sample II item checklist.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Individual Building Level Checklist for principals or teachers' use.

6. Reliability Information:

   Not Applicable.

7. Validation Information:

8. Distribution Permission:

   Implied.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   Article: How Effective is Your School?
   Instructor, October, 1982.

University of Oregon

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Checklist items content:

1) clear academic and social goals
2) curriculum linked to school-wide goals
3) teachers check student progress
4) everyone understands and accepts school rules
5) student responsibility for learning and behavior
6) promote high academic learning time
7) teachers and principals care about students
8) principals are strong leaders
9) parent and community support

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

Best used as bulletin board reminder or introduction to school effectiveness research findings. Checklist is brief and incomplete.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Framework for Analysis of Your School Improvement Endeavor As It Relates to School Effectiveness Characteristics.

2. Authors:

   Contact: Maureen McCormack-Larkin
   Project RISE

3. Institution:

   Milwaukee Public Schools
   Division of Curriculum and Instruction
   Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

4. Format and Components:

   9 page questionnaire to be completed by principal (elementary level).

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   A means for evaluation of the effects of building level school effectiveness plans at the end of the year. Results to be used as a basis for revising 2nd year plans. Used in project RISE.

6. Reliability Information:

   None

7. Validation Information:

   None

8. Distribution Permission:

   Contact Milwaukee Public Schools

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1) Essential Elements of Effective Schooling on the Elementary Level. Used as basis for school effectiveness plans in project RISE schools (2 page handout).
   2) Line graphs of performance on Metropolitan achievement tests.

Milwaukee Project RISE

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The project RISE questionnaire contains 67 items, some of which are close-ended (yes or no) and some of which are open-ended. Two questions cover the school's academic mission; 2 questions cover high expectations; 6 questions cover student sense of affiliation; 5 questions cover recognition of academic excellence; 3 cover school atmosphere; 6 cover grade-level objectives; 5 cover full content coverage; 3 cover accelerated curriculum; 9 cover structured learning environment; 6 cover key instructional behaviors; 2 cover direct instruction; 9 cover increased allocated time; 5 cover maximizing academic engaged time; 2 cover kindergarten instructional program; 5 cover implementation of coordinated services (includes coverage of "pull out" procedures for Chapter I) or frequent evaluation of student progress; 6 cover implementation of evaluation component; 3 cover test taking or report cards; 7 questions cover implementation of the parent/community support component, e.g., homework, attendance, and behavior policies.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

This instrument would be extremely tedious to tally responses and time consuming. Approximately half of the questions are open-ended. It was intended for in-building use and self-assessment, self-administered. Its intended use as an a posteriori measure does not make it feasible for an a priori diagnostic tool.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Pupil Activities Record - Revised (PAR-R)

2. Authors:

   Doss, Ligon and Friedman, 1980.

3. Institution:

   Austin Independent School District
   Office of Research and Evaluation

4. Format and Components:

   Codes Time on Task and off task behavior within each basic skills subject area.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Rates pupil on task or off task behavior within each basic skills subject area.

6. Reliability Information:

   Interrater reliability coefficients for individual codes ranged from .00 - .99. The majority of coefficients were above .9000.

7. Validation Information:

   See Ross and Ligon Final Technical Report: 1980-81 ESEA Title I Regular Program Publication No. 80.71, Austin Independent School District, Office of Research and Evaluation, 1980.

8. Distribution Permission:

   McREL does not have instrumentation or manual.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1) machine scorable
   2) manual available from Austin Independent School, Austin Publication #78.48.

Austin Independent School District

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

The system measures several context variables including pupil amount of time spent in each instructional area, size of instructional group, place of instruction, mode of instruction, content of instruction, contact with adults, teacher questioning strategy, teachers' use of a signal system and language of instruction (English, Spanish, etc.). It focuses on observation of one pupil for one entire school day, using one minute intervals. Coder training requires approximately 5 days and consists of 2 days of instruction and 3 days of field practice.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Secondary Observation Instrument (SOI)

2. Authors:

   Stallings, J., and Needels, M., 1981.

3. Institution:

   SRI International.

4. Format and Components:

   3 sections: 1) on and off task student activities
   2) 5 minute interaction section
   3) classroom snapshot section

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   For use across all secondary grade levels, all academic subject areas. Used to record both teacher and student behavior.

6. Reliability Information:

   Interobserver reliability coefficients for most coding categories 90 or above.

7. Validation Information:

   See Instrument Training Manual.

8. Distribution Permission:

   McREL does not have this instrument.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1. Secondary Observation Instrument Training Manual: Menlo Park, Calif.: SRI International, January, 1981.
   2. Precoded Videotape.

SRI International

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Instrument records codings of interactive on task activities (e.g., "Reading Along", "Discussion"), Non-interactive On-Task Activities (e.g., "Reading Silently") and Off-Task Activities (e.g., "Students Uninvolved"). It records context variables in the snapshot section with coding categories for activity, materials, number and kind of groupings, and if an adult is present. Records interactions in categories of "who", "to whom", "what" and "how". Identification and classroom information is coded once per classroom period. Classroom snapshot and 5 minute interaction are coded 5 times per classroom period.

Observers can be trained to use the classroom snapshot in 2 hours. Training for the 5 minute interaction section required 5 days. At the end of the training, all observers must reach a criterion level of 80% or above agreement with a precoded videotape.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

The SOI is unique with respect to its design for secondary use.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Student-level Observation of Beginning Reading (SOBR)

2. Authors:

   Lomax, R.; Feinhardt, G. and Seewald, A.M.; 1980-81.

3. Institution:

4. Format and Components:

   Instrument records on and off task behavior of students and teacher or aide behavior.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Measure engaged learning time in 8 categories of student behavior and 5 categories of teacher and aide behavior and 2 categories of reading or math content. For use in all grade levels for coding any type of instruction that includes reading.

6. Reliability Information:

   Average stability coefficient of .98 with 30 hrs. of observation per student and over .85 with 5 hours. Average 80% interobserver agreement.

7. Validation Information:

   See Lomax, R. A Generalizability Study of the Classroom Observations of Learning Disabled Students. Paper presented at AERA, Boston, 1980.

8. Distribution Permission:

   McREL does not have this instrumentation.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1. Self-instructional Training Manual
   2. Hand-scorable

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Instrument records coding of on-task and off-task behavior, such as "waiting", "direct reading", "academic other", etc. Teacher and aide behavior codes include "academic other", "management", "reading instruction", and breakdown codes of "direct", and "indirect reading". The time sampling interval is 20 seconds per child. Training requires approximately 15 hours and includes 5 trainer-led sessions and field practice.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

Format is unique in coding affective behavior, classifying "positive" or "negative".

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

Student Engagement Ratings

2. Authors:

Emmer, Evertson and Clements, 1980.

3. Institution:

University of Texas at Austin
Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

4. Format and Components:

Engaged learning time observation system

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

Whole class or small group format, lesson topic and number of students coded; measures on and off-task behavior.

6. Reliability Information:

Interobserver Reliability Coefficients reported:

Definitely on task, Academic	= .71
Probably on task, Academic	= .0
Definitely on task, Procedural	= .67
Probably on task, Procedural	= .65
Off task, Sanctioned	= .78
Off task, Unsanctioned	= .74
Dead time	= .0

7. Validation Information:

Emmer, Evertson and Anderson obtained a correlation of .51 between number of students on task per observation in the first 3 weeks of school and number of students on task per observation - during remainder of school year. A correlation of .54 was obtained for similar comparisons of off-task behavior.

8. Distribution Permission:

McREL does not possess these materials: Contact University of Texas at Austin Center.

9. Supplemental Materials:

1) Requires 2-3 hours of group instruction and practice trials using videotapes of classroom activity
2) Training manual

U. of Texas-Austin

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Engaged learning time variables measured include:
1) definitely on task academic
2) probably on task academic
3) definitely on task procedural
4) probably on task procedural
5) off task sanctioned
6) off task unsanctioned
7) dead time
8) no data

It codes all students in the class and is applicable across all grades, all academic subject areas. The sampling interval varies from 4 ratings per hour (every 15 minutes) to 6 ratings per hour (every 10 minutes). Authors recommend coding 7-8 hours across several days in the first 3 weeks of school and 7-8 hours across several days for the remainder of the school year.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES)
   Observation System

2. Authors:

   Marbaire, R., Fisher, C.W., Filby, N.N., and Dishaw, M., 1976.

3. Institution:

   Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

4. Format and Components:

   Codes behavior in categories representing setting, content of instruction, difficulty level of work, instructor behavior and interactions with students.

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Instrument measures engaged learning time for use in reading and mathematics classes; was used in second and fifth grade classrooms.

6. Reliability Information:

   Inter-observer Reliability Coefficients for individual codes ranged from .07 - .99; majority above .80. Coefficients representing stability of coding categories across observers and occasions for task difficulty categories ranged from .21 to .80, with majority above .50.

7. Validation Information:

   See Technical Report I-5, Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, 1977, available from Far West Lab.

8. Distribution Permission:

   Contact authors: McREL does not have this instrumentation.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   1. Manual
   2. Machine scorable forms

Far West Laboratory for Educ. Research and Dev.

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Instrument records codings of content and context variables including: 1) general content [wait, transition, management, break, non-academic instruction, academic instruction], 2) setting [self-paced, other-paced], 3) instructor moves [academic observational monitoring, academic feedback, question, explanation, etc.], 4) focus of instructor move [teacher, adult, etc.], 5) reading content [decoding, word structure, etc.], 6) math content [division, multiplication, etc.]. The observer judges the student's success rate as easy, medium or difficult. Target students are observed and their behavior recorded in 3-6 minute cycles.

11. Comments (Effective Schools Measures):

This is one of few instruments in which judgement is made and coded concerning students' success rates. Instrumentation system would need modifications in content categories to be applicable across all grade levels.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MEASURES -
DESCRIPTION AND CRITIQUE REPORT

1. Instrument Title:

   Good and Beckerman System

2. Authors:

   Good, T.L. and Beckerman, T.M., 1978.

3. Institution:

   Research for Better Schools

4. Format and Components:

   Hand scorable

5. Intended Purpose and Uses:

   Measures engaged learning time
   1) student involvement type, 2) setting type, 3) activity type. To be used across all grades, all subject areas.

6. Reliability Information:

   Interrater reliability/agreement of 85% (among 6 coders).

7. Validation Information:

8. Distribution Permission:

   Contact Good and Beckerman. McREL does not have this instrumentation.

9. Supplemental Materials:

   Training requires approximately 20 hours, consisting of instruction, coding sessions with videotapes and field practice.

Research for Better Schools

10. Content/Description (Effective Schools Measures):

Instrument records behavior of all schools in a class; the observer codes one pupil and moves on to the next. All pupils are coded in 5 minute cycles.

APPENDIX

LIST OF PROGRAMS AND DISTRICTS

Developer and program title	Elem	MS/JHS	SHS	Districts Using
Alaska				
Department of Education, Effective Schooling Project	2	1	3	Alaska Gateway, AK Anchorage, AK Mat-Su, AK
Arkansas				
State Education Agency, Program for Effective Teaching	DK	DK	DK	Approx. 470 Districts
California				
Los Angeles County Schools Quality Skill Building Program	435	75	100	Los Angeles, CA
San Mateo Public Schools, Untitled	0	1	0	San Mateo, CA
Stallings Teaching and Learning Instit. Effective Use of Time Program	DK	DK	DK	Cupertino, CA Mountain View/Los Altos Sunnyvale, CA Wisman, CA Washington, DC Detroit, MI Putnam County, WV
Colorado				
Department of Education, Accountability/Accreditation Program	DK	DK	DK	Approx, 90 Districts
Department of Education, School Climate Program	30	15	15	Approx. 60 Districts
Loveland Public Schools, Untitled	0	1	0	Loveland, CO
Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Effective Schools Program	DK	DK	DK	Approx 40 Districts
Denver Public Schools, Interaction and Achievement	3	0	0	Denver, CO

* This list is organized by state of the program's developer. Many programs are being implemented outside their state of origin.
DK = respondent does not know.

(Courtesy of Matthew B. Miles, Center for Policy Research, Inc.: Updated 3/84)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Connecticut				
New Haven Public Schools, Urban Academy	28	6	0	New Haven, CT
State Department of Education, School Effectiveness Project	21	1	2	Coventry, CT Griswold, CT Hartford, CT Meriden, CT New Britain, CT New London, CT Oxford, CT Stamford, CT Vernon, CT West Haven, CT
Delaware				
State Department of Public Instruction, Untitled	54	40	26	Appoquinimink, DE Brandywine, DE Caesar Rodney, DE Cape Henlopen, DE Capital, DE Christina, DE Colonial, DE Delmar, DE Indian River, DE Lake Forest, DE Laurel, DE Milford, DE Red Clay, DE Seaford, DE Smyrna, DE Woodbridge, DE
Kentucky				
State Department of Education, School Climate Improvement	5	5	5	Buckner, KY Campbellsville, KY Clinton, KY Danville, KY Elizabethtown, KY Florence, KY Frankfort, KY Louisville, KY Richmond, KY
Maryland				
State Department of Education School Improvement through Instructional Improvement (SITIP)	50	9	9	All 24 counties
Michigan				
Detroit Public Schools, School Improvement Program	3	2	1	Detroit, MI
Detroit Public Schools, High School Recognition Program	0	0	8	Detroit, MI

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Michigan cont'd				
Michigan Middle Cities Association, Untitled	DK	DK	DK	Battle Creek, MI Bay City, MI Benton Harbor, MI Flint, MI Grand Rapids, MI Jackson, MI Kalamazoo, MI Lansing, MI Marquette, MI Midland, MI Monroe, MI Muskegon, MI Muskegon Heights, MI Niles, MI Pontiac, MI Saginaw, MI Southfield, MI Willow Run, MI Ypsilanti, MI
Missouri				
State Department of Education, Instructional Management System	DK	DK	DK	Approx. 200 districts
New Jersey				
Department of Education Comprehensive Basic Skills Review	65	12	30	(Secondary users only) Pleasantville, NJ Camden, NJ Newark, NJ East Orange, NJ Orange, NJ Irvington, NJ Sussex, NJ Jersey City, NJ Hoboken, NJ Trenton, NJ New Brunswick, NJ Keansburg, NJ Paterson, NJ Passaic, NJ
Newark Public Schools, Untitled (based on study, Characteristics of High Achieving Elementary Schools in Newark)	4	0	0	Newark, NJ
New Mexico				
Department of Justice, School Climate Improvement	17	20	6	26 districts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New York				
New York City Schools, High School Improvement Project	0	0	4	New York, NY
New York City Schools, School Improvement Program	25	0	0	New York, NY
New York Urban Coalition, Local School Development Program	37	13	0	New York, NY
North Carolina				
Center for Early Adolescence, Middle Grades Assessment Program	0	10	0	Charlotte City, NC Durham, NC Greensboro, NC Johnston City, NC St. Louis, MO Pocantico Hills, NY East Cleveland, OH
Ohio				
Department of Education, and Kent State Center for Educational Development and Strategic Services (KEDS)	84	6	10	Bedford, OH Canton, OH Cincinnati, OH Cleveland, OH Dayton, OH Columbus, OH East Cleveland, OH Greenhills-Forest Park, OH Lorain, OH Mansfield, OH Shaker Heights, OH Steubenville, OH Streetsboro, OH Tallmadge, OH Toledo, OH Warrensville Heights, OH Youngstown, OH
Oregon				
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Goal-Based Education	18	4	13	Camus, WA Seattle, WA Tacoma, WA Yakima, WA See also Alaska SEA (3 districts)
Portland Public Schools, Student Achievement Policy	100	0	10	Portland, OR

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pennsylvania				
Philadelphia Public Schools, Expectations Project	6	0	0	Philadelphia, PA
Research for Better Schools and New Jersey Education Association, School Effectiveness Training	5	3	0	Atlantic City, NJ Jersey City, NJ Paterson, NJ Camden, NJ Plainfield, NJ Reading, PA
Research for Better Schools and New Jersey Education Association, School Effectiveness Training (High School Version)	0	0	1	Atlantic City, NJ
Research for Better Schools, Achievement-Directed Leadership	15	3	2	Appoquinimink, DE New Brunswick, NJ Bethlehem, PA
Utah				
Ogden Public Schools, Incentive-Productivity Model	0	1	0	Ogden, UT
Salt Lake City Schools, School Climate Program	2	1	1	Salt Lake City, UT
Vermont				
University of Vermont, Untitled	7	0	1	Cabot, VT Duxbury, VT Hardwick, VT
Washington				
Seattle Public Schools, School Effectiveness Project	5	7	0	Seattle, WA
Seattle Public Schools, Project ACCESS	0	0	10	Seattle, WA
Wisconsin				
University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Program for the Renewal and Improvement of Secondary Education (WRISE)	0	40	20	Appleton, WI Barneveld, WI Balsam Lake, WI Beloit, WI Brown Deer, WI Cameron, WI East Troy, WI Franklin, WI Green Bay, WI Hartford, WI

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Wisconsin cont'd

				Hartland, WI Juda, WI Keshena, WI Maple, WI Mequon, WI Milton, WI Oconto Falls, WI Plymouth, WI Port Edwards, WI Portage, WI Prairie du Sac, WI Rhinelander, WI Seymour, WI Sheboygan Falls, WI Watertown, WI Waunakee, WI Wauwatosa, WI Whitefish Bay, WI
Milwaukee Public Schools, Project RISE (Rising to Individual School Excellence)	18	1	0	Milwaukee, WI

Section III

Annotated Bibliography of Related Instruments

Section III

Annotated Bibliography of Related Instruments

Fox, R.W. "How Positive is Your School Climate?" in "School Climate Improvement: A Challenge to the School Administrator." Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1982.
This is a "checklist" designed to give a snapshot of school climate. Ten items are rank ordered from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

Hathaway, W. Student Achievement Policy. Portland, Oregon schools. n.d.
This document includes a needs assessment checklist called "Instructional Effectiveness Checklist" of 15 items on instructional practices. It can be used by both elementary and secondary teachers.

Herskowitz, H. and Paynther, T. "Procedural Guide for Implementing Effective Schools Characteristics in a Desegregated Setting." Kent State Center for Educational Development.
The appendix of this document contains sample items from the Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire and Interview. Also included is a Leader's Study Guide for Videotape, Desegregation and Improving School Effectiveness, 1981.

Howard, Eugene. "Are You a Good Climate Leader?" in Howard, Classroom Control Index, School Discipline Desk Book. West Nyack, NY, Parker Publishing Co., 1978.
A 15 item questionnaire that assesses relationships with students, managing the classroom, and instructional techniques. Response categories range from "almost never" to "almost always."

Howard, Eugene. Successful Practices for Making the Curriculum More Flexible. Denver, Colorado; copyright 1982.
This instrument consists of a list of practices reported as promising or successful in schools in which curriculum flexibility is desired. It rests in the assumption that the curriculum can be varied to accommodate individual differences. Responses are rated in 2 categories, "What Is" and "Impact Potential."

Howard, Eugene. Mini Audit #2. Activities and Projects for Climate Improvement. Process Determinants and Material Determinants. n.d.
The system includes a packet containing the mini audit measure. This consists of a 9-page questionnaire (55 items) designed to assess the climate of a school in terms of specific activities, programs and practices. Respondents (teacher, parent, administrator) rank order items in two response categories, "What Is" and "What Should Be."

Klausmeier, H., Lipham, J. and Daresh, J. The Renewal and Improvement of Secondary Education: Concepts and Practices. University of Wisconsin; Research and Development Center for Individualized Schooling, 1980.

This document contains a series of questionnaires including a desirability scale of comprehensive objectives, a Learning Styles Inventory (for students) and a form for recording amount of time allocated per course in a student course rating form. Other staff, students' and professors' questionnaires (some pre-post text) are included for evaluation of field test (RISE Program).

New York Urban Coalition. Local school development project. n.d.
This document includes in the appendix a checklist for school improvement planning team members and a staff questionnaire. The questionnaire is rated on a Likert-type scale in 2 response categories, "What Is" and "What Should Be." It assesses perceptions regarding goals, student assessment, instructional methods, materials, coordination, resources, and time and scheduling. A separate math assessment, reading assessment and language skills development perceptions assessment, and school environment measure, is included. The student and parent questionnaires assess attitudes.

Nordengren, C., Veseth, R., McDowell, K. and Lindahl, R. New Mexico School Climate Improvement Process. 1973.
Report of a project supported by a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice. The improvement program consists of 8 steps:

1) Raising the level of faculty, student and parent awareness (through workshops).
2) Forming School Climate Improvement Committee (manages, supports, and assesses).
3) Collecting baseline data (on morale and climate symptoms).
4) Assessing the School's Climate (a mini-audit by visiting team).
5) Brainstorming and prioritizing (judgements based on mini-audit).
6) Forming task forces (to initiate projects and activities).
7) Managing task forces (by SCIC and the principal).
8) Evaluating (instruments and procedures to evaluate the extent of school climate improvement).

The instrument is the CFK Ltd. School Climate Profile, a Likert-type, 5-page questionnaire requiring two responses per item, "What Is" and "What Should Be." The questionnaire can be completed by any staff member or student. It assesses perceptions regarding such categories as trust, respect, morale, cohesiveness, school renewal, input opportunity, academic and social growth and caring.

Ohio Department of Education. The Ohio Academy for School Improvement Strategies: Proceedings of a Conference Held On August 2-6, 1982 at the Ohio State University. Columbus, OH. Published by Ohio State Department of Education, 1982.
This document includes a Summary of Pre-Oasis Needs Assessment. Items are ranked as 2 categories: 1) General Needs, and 2) My Personal Needs. Items reflect skills to improve instruction, specialized knowledge and curriculum projects; 3) Basic Instruction, and 4) Teaching/Learning Model.

Seattle Public Schools, Burton, N., Toews, E. and Binhaum, D. School-based Planning Manual. Project ACCESS Report funded by the Ford Foundation, 1982.
Part II, Supplementary Materials, includes a 30-item needs assessment covering "Improved Academic Achievement" and "School Climate." It can be completed by staff, student or citizen. Part I is a planning guide.

Sloan, E. Year-end Progress Report: "Expectations Project". Submitted to Edward McHazen Foundation by School District of Philadelphia, 1979.
This document includes a series of many questionnaires and observation guides that reflect on school assessment, the community perceptions, staff beliefs, administrator practices, etc. (including "Use of the P.A. System") and discussion questions for feeding information back to staff. Some observation guides use a cloze format. It lists some interesting and unusual questions and observation formats.

Section IV

Bibliography of Related Literature

Section IV

Bibliography of Related Literature

Edmonds, R. Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools that are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children. 1977, ERIC ED 142 610.

Edmonds, R. Search for Effective Schools. 1980. ERIC ED 212 689.

Frederickson, J. Models for Determining a School's Effectiveness. 1980, paper presented at AERA, Boston. ERIC.

Gentry, R. A Descriptive Study of Quality Schools to Determine Effective Procedures for Curriculum Development. Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts International, No. 67-12, 897.

Goldberg, S., & Spartz. The Use of Longitudinal Analysis to Identify More and Less Effective Schools. 1978, ERIC ED 167 598.

Guthrie, J. A Survey of School Effectiveness Studies. 1970, ERIC ED 095 197.

Klaus, M. Issues in Identifying Effective Schools. 1982, ERIC ED 222 571.

Klausmeier, H.J. Identification of Policies and Practices That Assure Institutionalization of Successful Local School Improvement Processes. Proposal for 1983 work - revised 9/10/82.

Klitgaard, R. and Hall, G. A Statistical Search for Unusually Effective Schools, 1973. Paper prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Klitgaard, R. Are There Unusually Effective Schools? 1973. Rand Corp. ERIC ED 085 405.

Kramer, M.J. Applying the Characteristics of Effective Schools to Professional Development, 1980. ERIC. Connecticut Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lezotte, L. Documenting Successful Schools: Is There a Better Way? 1980, ERIC ED 193 762.

Mann, D. and Lawrence, J. A Delphi Analysis of the Instructionally Effective School. Teachers College, Columbia University. Report prepared for School Finance Project of the National Institute of Education, 1983.

Rules, M. Review of Effective Schools Programs. Vol. II. The Extent of Adoption of Effective Schools Programs. Prepared for National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington, D.C. 20208, 1983.

Sirois, H. and Villanova, R. Theory Into Practice: A Theoretical and Research Base for the Characteristics of Effective Schools. 1982. ERIC ED 217 558.

Turnbull, B. State Policy Options for Educational Quality, 1983. Report prepared for Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.

Section V

Instruments in Preparation and Dates

Section V

Instruments in Preparation and Dates

1) Cleveland School Effectiveness Project - Evaluation instruments being developed. Contact: Maureen McCormack-Larkin, Milwaukee, Wisc. n.d.

2) Achievement Directed Leadership Program.
Contact: David Helms Dec. '83
Developing Instruments and materials sent to NIE.

3) Chapter I
Contact: Skip McCann
Comprehensive basic skills review process attending to 15 classroom/school variables. Instrumentation available Dec. '83.

4) Urban Education Component
The Regional Exchange - RBS
Contact: Tom Corcoran
Instrumentation available Dec. '83.